

**REMARKS**

**Specification Amendments.** The Applicant has amended the specification herein to correct typographical errors in the specification. No new matter was introduced by the amendments to the specification.

**Claim 11 Objection.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Hollweg objected to dependent claim 11 for lacking an antecedent basis for “the further contact member”. The Applicant has amended dependent claim 11 herein to provide a proper antecedent basis for “a further contact member”, and no new matter was introduced by the amendment to dependent claim 11. Withdrawal of the objection to dependent claim 11 is therefore respectfully requested.

**Claims 1, 2 and 4 Amendments.** The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2 and 4 herein to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of claims 1, 2 and 4, and NOT to overcome any rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 by Examiner Hollweg. No new matter was introduced by the amendment of claims 1, 2 and 4 herein.

**Claim Rejections.** In the Non-Final Office Action, Examiner Hollweg rejected pending claims 1-11 on various grounds. The Applicant responds to each rejection as subsequently recited herein, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application:

- A. Examiner Hollweg rejected claims 1-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,525,454 B2 to *Calon et al.*

The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Hollweg’s remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-4 and 6-11 over *Calon*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *Calon*. To warrant this §102(b) rejection of claims 1-4 and 6-11, each and every element as set forth in independent claim 1 must be either expressly or inherently described in *Calon*. See, MPEP

§2131. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §102(b) rejection of independent claim 1, because *Calon* fails to describe, expressly or inherently, “a conduction member (9) being connected to the second current-supply conductor (8) and extending through the opening (14) in the center section of the reflector (11)” and “the conduction member (9) being connected to a contact member (10) provided on a surface of the reflector (11) facing away from the discharge lamp (1)” as originally recited in independent claim 1.

Specifically, as described in *Calon* at page 4, line 46 to page 5, line 29, a careful review of *Calon* reveals that *Calon* in fact teaches:

(1) a discharge lamp 20, 21, 30 and a concave reflector 4 arranged around a longitudinal axis 2 as shown in FIG. 1,

(2) discharge lamp 20, 21, 30 being closed in a gastight manner and comprising a first end portion extending through an opening arranged in a center section of reflector 4 and a second end portion extending through an opening in a neck 5 integrated with reflector 4 as shown in FIG. 1,

(3) discharge lamp 20, 21, 30 having an ionizable gas filling,

(4) a pair of current-supply conductors 26 having ends 29 serving as electrodes and opposing ends (unreferenced) issuing to an exterior of the discharge lamp 20, 21, 30 as shown in FIGS. 1 and 2,

(5) a lamp cap 10 fixed around a free end portion 8 of neck 5 as shown in FIG. 1,

(6) lamp cap 10 being provided with a contact 11a centrally situated on a bottom exterior surface of an insulator body 40 and connected to one of the current supply conductors 26 via a conduction member 43a as shown in FIG. 2, and

(7) lamp cap 10 being further provided with a contact 11b that is clamped between insulator body 40 and lamp cap 10 and connected to the other current supply conductor 26 via a conduction member 43 as shown in FIG. 2.

*Calon* clearly fails to describe, expressly or inherently, conduction member 43 and/or conduction member 43a extending through a center section of reflector 4 or its neck 5 as required by the limitation “a conduction member (9) being connected to the second current-supply

conductor (8) and extending through the opening (14) in the center section of the reflector (11)"of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, *Calon* clearly fails to describe, expressly or inherently, contact 11a and/or contact 11b being provided on a surface of reflector 4 or its neck 5 facing away from discharge lamp 20, 21, 30 as required by the limitation "the conduction member (9) being connected to a contact member (10) provided on a surface of the reflector (11) facing away from the discharge lamp (1)"of independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Calon* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4 and 6-11 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11 are allowable over *Calon* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Calon*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-4 and 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Calon* is therefore respectfully requested.

- B.** Examiner Hollweg rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,525,424 B2 to *Calon* et al.

Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claim 5 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 5 is allowable over *Calon* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *Calon*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Calon* is therefore respectfully requested.

**SUMMARY**

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-11 as listed herein fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Hollweg is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: **June 30, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,  
Patrick Cyriel Van De Voorde

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
& STANDARDS  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

---

Chris M. Ries  
Registration No. 45,799  
Attorney for Appellant

WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY,  
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

---

/Darrin Wesley Harris, 40636/  
Darrin Wesley Harris  
Registration No. 40,636  
Attorney for Applicant